



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,652	03/07/2006	Jorge Diniz Loureiro	41952/314792	1516
23370	7590	10/28/2008	EXAMINER	
JOHN S. PRATT, ESQ			HOANG, SON T	
KILPATRICK STOCKTON, LLP			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1100 PEACHTREE STREET			2165	
ATLANTA, GA 30309				
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		10/28/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/531,652	Applicant(s) LOUREIRO, JORGE DINIZ QUEIROGA
	Examiner SON T. HOANG	Art Unit 2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 3-16 and 18-20 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 3-16 and 18-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 15 April 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 17, 2008 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. **Claims 3, 15, and 18** have been amended.

Claims 3-16, and 18-20 are pending in this Office action.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments to the claims have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection presented herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. **Claims 3-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 3 contains indefinite words such as: '*being*' on lines 3 & 7.

Claims 15 contains indefinite words such as: '*being*' on lines 4 & 11, '*to be*' on line 6, '*can be*' on line 7, and '*when*' on line 14.

The presence of these words causes the claims to be broad and indefinite. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 4-14, and 16 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph for their dependencies on **claims 3, and 15** respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. **Claims 3-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matters.

Regarding **claim 3**, a "*computer program product*" comprising multiple components, i.e. program instructions for compiling, program instructions for linking, is being claimed. However, each of these components can easily be interpreted as software *per se* and functional descriptive material consisting of data structures and computer programs, which impart functionality when employed as a computer component.

Applicant has amended this instant claim with a computer-storage medium configured to store these software components. However, the storage medium claimed is not part of the "*computer program product*" being claimed; therefore, it

Art Unit: 2165

cannot be used to establish a statutory category of invention since the subject matters being claimed are still those software components.

To overcome the above rejection, Applicant is suggested to change the subject matters being claimed directly to a hardware component. One example can be:

"A computer-storage medium having computer program instructions stored thereon, said instructions for causing a processor to execute a method to enable management of information relating to a particular topic, comprising:

compiling a database in which the information is stored, the database comprising a plurality of portions, each of the plurality of portions is subdivided into sub-portions in which information is stored; and

linking the sub-portions of ..."

Regarding **claim 15**, an "*information management product*" comprising multiple components, i.e. database component and computer program component, is being claimed. However, each of these components can easily be interpreted as software per se and functional descriptive material consisting of data structures and computer programs, which impart functionality when employed as a computer component.

Applicant has amended this instant claim with a computer-storage medium configured to store these software components. However, the cited storage medium is not part of the "*information management product*" being claimed; therefore, it cannot be used to establish a statutory category of invention since the subject matters being claimed are still those software components.

To overcome the above rejection, Applicant is suggested to change the subject matters being claimed directly to a hardware component. One example can be:

"An information management product which comprises:

a computer-storage medium for storing a database component and a computer program component;

said database component configured to store information relating to a particular topic and comprising a plurality of portions, each of the plurality of portions is subdivided into sub-portions in which information on a particular aspect of the topic is stored; and

said computer program component configured to manage the information relating to the particular topic stored by the database component, the computer program component for causing a processor to execute a method of linking the sub-portions of each of the plurality of portions to one another in a predetermined sequential arrangement wherein the information is stored in the sub-portions, each subsequent sub-portion in the predetermined sequential arrangement contains further information on the topic".

The claimed "computer program product" (**claim 3**), and "information management product" (**claim 15**) are each not a process occurring as a result of actually executing the software components, a machine programmed to operate in accordance with the software components, nor a manufacture structurally and functionally interconnected with the software components in a manner which enables the software components to carry out their functionalities. The claimed

Art Unit: 2165

system is also not a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, it fails to fall within a statutory category. It is, at best, functional descriptive material *per se*.

Claims 4-14, and 16 fail to resolve the deficiencies of **claims 3, and 15** and only further limit the scopes of **claims 3, and 15** respectively. Therefore, **claims 4-14, and 16** are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101.

The claims above lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material *per se*.

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material *per se*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994)

Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic

Art Unit: 2165

carrier signal, does not make it statutory. See Diehr, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because “[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer.”)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate Paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this Section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

9. **Claims 3, 15-16, 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Oren et al. (Pat. No. US 6,539,387, filed on July 7, 1997; hereinafter Oren).

Regarding **claim 3**, Oren clearly shows and discloses a computer program product stored on a computer-readable medium and executable by a processor ([Column 3, Lines 56-63]), the computer program product comprising:

program instructions (*source code*, [Column 6, Lines 34-47]) for compiling a database in which the information is stored, the database comprising a plurality of portions, each of the plurality of portions being subdivided into sub-portions in which information is stored (*Figure 2 shows the database structure with the circles 18 representing documents or pages containing information and the lines 20 representing connections between the pages 18. The pages are organized in a hierarchical fashion--each page is assigned to a level in the hierarchy and connections or links are made between pages at one level and related pages at other levels. The hierarchy is organized as chapters, one or more levels of subchapters, and pages within the chapters or subchapters*, [Column 7, Lines 5-17]); and

program instructions (*source code*, [Column 6, Lines 34-47]) for linking the sub-portions of each of the plurality of portions of the database to one another in a predetermined sequential arrangement such that, when the information is stored in the sub-portions, each subsequent sub-portion in the predetermined sequential arrangement contains further information on the topic (*The data units may comprise pages and chapters, each chapter being linked to one or more pages. At least one hypertext link may link each chapter to each of the one or more pages linked to that chapter. Further, at least one page may be linked*

simultaneously to two or more chapters, one chapter of which is labeled as a default chapter for the at least one page, [Column 4, Lines 37-44]).

Regarding **claim 15**, Oren clearly shows and discloses an information management product ([Column 3, Lines 56-63]), which comprises:

a database component configured to store information relating to a particular topic, the database component being stored on a computer-storage medium and comprising a plurality of portions, each of the plurality of portions being subdivided into sub-portions in which information on a particular aspect of the topic can be stored (*Figure 2 shows the database structure with the circles 18 representing documents or pages containing information and the lines 20 representing connections between the pages 18. The pages are organized in a hierarchical fashion--each page is assigned to a level in the hierarchy and connections or links are made between pages at one level and related pages at other levels. The hierarchy is organized as chapters, one or more levels of subchapters, and pages within the chapters or subchapters, [Column 7, Lines 5-17]); and*

a computer program component (*source code, [Column 6, Lines 34-47]*) configured to manage the information relating to the particular topic stored by the database component, the computer program component being stored on the computer-storage medium and executable by a processor and including program instructions for linking the sub-portions of each of the plurality of portions to one another in a predetermined sequential arrangement wherein when the

information is stored in the sub-portions, each subsequent sub-portion in the predetermined sequential arrangement contains further information on the topic (*The data units may comprise pages and chapters, each chapter being linked to one or more pages. At least one hypertext link may link each chapter to each of the one or more pages linked to that chapter. Further, at least one page may be linked simultaneously to two or more chapters, one chapter of which is labeled as a default chapter for the at least one page, [Column 4, Lines 37-44]*).

Regarding **claim 16**, Oren further discloses the sub-portions are linked to one another in a predetermined sequential arrangement wherein each subsequent sub-portion in the sequential arrangement can contain further information on the topic (*The hierarchy is organized as chapters, one or more levels of subchapters, and pages within the chapters or subchapters, [Column 7, Lines 5-17]. It is clear that subchapter provides further information of the corresponding chapter*).

Regarding **claim 18**, Oren clearly shows and discloses a method of compiling a database of information relating to a particular topic ([Column 3, Lines 20-24]), which includes the steps of:

compiling a plurality of portions of the database, wherein each of the plurality of portions is subdivided into a plurality of sub-portions (*Figure 2 shows the database structure with the circles 18 representing documents or pages containing information and the lines 20 representing connections between the pages 18. The pages are organized in a hierarchical fashion--each page is*

Art Unit: 2165

assigned to a level in the hierarchy and connections or links are made between pages at one level and related pages at other levels. The hierarchy is organized as chapters, one or more levels of subchapters, and pages within the chapters or subchapters, [Column 7, Lines 5-17]);

linking each of the plurality of sub-portions of each of the plurality of portions of the database to one another in a predetermined sequential arrangement (*The data units may comprise pages and chapters, each chapter being linked to one or more pages. At least one hypertext link may link each chapter to each of the one or more pages linked to that chapter. Further, at least one page may be linked simultaneously to two or more chapters, one chapter of which is labeled as a default chapter for the at least one page, [Column 4, Lines 37-44]; and*

storing the information by inserting the information in the sub-portions in an arrangement wherein each subsequent sub-portion contains further information on the topic than in an immediately preceding sub-portion to which the subsequent sub-portion is linked (*The hierarchy is organized as chapters, one or more levels of subchapters, and pages within the chapters or subchapters, [Column 7, Lines 5-17]. It is clear that subchapter provides further information of the corresponding chapter.*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2165

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. **Claims 4-7, 14, and 19-20**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oren et al. (Pat. No. US 6,539,387, filed on July 7, 1997; hereinafter Oren) in view of Flinn et al. (Pub. No. US 2001/0047358, filed on March 13, 2001; hereinafter Flinn).

Regarding **claims 4, and 19**, Oren discloses establishing a user-executable navigation link from at least one sub-portion of the database to another sub-portion of the database, thereby permitting a user to navigate from said one portion to said other sub-portion, and returning a user to the sub-portion from which the navigation link is made, in use ([Column 6, Line 1 → Column 7, Line 13]).

Oren does not explicitly disclose recording the address in the database of each sub-portion from which a navigation link is made.

However, Flinn discloses recording the address in the database of each sub-portion from which a navigation link is made (*the referenced information may include files, text, documents, articles, images, audio, video, multi-media, software applications and electronic or magnetic media or signals. Where the content object supplies a pointer to information, the pointer may be a memory address. Where the content network encapsulates information on the Internet, the pointer may be a Uniform Resource Locator (URL), [0044]*

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Flinn with the teachings of Oren for the purpose of managing information encapsulates the information as objects by facilitating the relationship between the objects ([Abstract] of Flinn).

Regarding **claims 5, and 20**, Oren further discloses displaying a view of the sub-portion from which the navigation link is made, in the same format as it was displayed before the navigation link to another sub-portion was made (*each screen or page is limited to contain only as much information, i.e., only as many paragraphs, as can be displayed at one time on a display. This is implemented by storing the paragraph height for each paragraph in the Paragraph table. This presents all the information in a screen to the user at once, and avoids the need for the user to scroll down the screen in order to see additional information*, [Column 7, Lines 58-65]).

Regarding **claims 6, and 14**, Flinn further discloses recording and displaying title information representing each sub-portion from which the navigation link is made so as to provide a user with a record of those sub- portions of the database from which navigation links are made (*meta-information include a title, a sub-title, one or more descriptions of the topic provided at different levels of detail, the publisher of the topic meta-information, the date the topic object was created. Meta-information may also include a pointer such as uniform resource locator (URL), [0045]. See further [0111] for displaying the metadata*)

Art Unit: 2165

Regarding **claim 7**, Oren further discloses defining primary key expressions in information that is stored, in use, by a compiler in selected sub-portions of the database and for establishing said navigation link to said other sub-portion of the database by a user selecting said primary key expression (*Each paragraph is also assigned a type, which is stored in the Paragraph table shown in FIG. 3. The choice of paragraph types varies depending upon the type of chapter, and these choices are stored in the Paragraph types table 27 and linked to the Paragraph table 22. For example, a disease type chapter has paragraph types including those shown as headings in FIG. 4. The use of these chapter and paragraph types provides the capability to perform a keyword search for a word or term limited to a specific type of chapter or paragraph, or to limit a search through an index to a specific type of chapter or paragraph, [Column 8, Lines 55-65]).*

12. **Claims 8-11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oren et al. (Pat. No. US 6,539,387, filed on July 7, 1997; hereinafter Oren) in view of Flinn et al. (Pub. No. US 2001/0047358, filed on March 13, 2001; hereinafter Flinn), and further in view of Flora et al. (Pat. No. US 6,714,215, filed on May 19, 2000; hereinafter Flora).

Regarding **claim 8**, Oren, as modified by Flinn, does not explicitly disclose establishing explanatory notes in which information can be entered by a compiler and for defining secondary key expressions in information that is stored, in use, by a compiler in selected sub-portions of the database and for linking each secondary key expression to a particular associated explanatory note in an arrangement wherein the

selection of a primary key expression by a user will cause the associated explanatory note to be displayed.

However, Flora discloses establishing explanatory notes in which information can be entered by a compiler and for defining secondary key expressions in information that is stored, in use, by a compiler in selected sub-portions of the database and for linking each secondary key expression to a particular associated explanatory note in an arrangement wherein the selection of a primary key expression by a user will cause the associated explanatory note to be displayed (*the user is able to execute a hyperlink and display an expanded version of the visual media item. The user can jump to an expanded version of a visual media item that could include such things as explanatory text, related text articles or further hyperlinks to related information*, [Column 7, Lines 39-52]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Flora with the teachings of Oren, as modified by Flinn, for the purpose of allowing a user to directly access items of visual and/or audio media by passing a cursor over points on an electronic map ([Abstract] of Flora).

Regarding **claim 9**, Flora further discloses defining primary key expressions in said explanatory notes and for establishing said navigation link from primary key expressions in said explanatory notes, to pre-determined sub-portions of the database (*a user is able to execute a hyperlink and display an expanded version of the visual media item. This expanded version could include further hyperlinks to related information or related text articles*, ([Column 7, Lines 39-52]). *It is obvious that these*

further hyperlinks could be primary expressions which link to another portion of the database).

Regarding **claim 10**, Flora further discloses defining secondary key expressions in selected explanatory notes and for linking each secondary key expression to another explanatory note (*a user is able to execute a hyperlink and display an expanded version of the visual media item. This expanded version could include further hyperlinks to related information or related text articles, ([Column 7, Lines 39-52]). It is obvious that these further hyperlinks could be secondary expressions which link to another portion of the database*).

Regarding **claim 11**, Flinn further discloses establishing default explanatory notes in which information can be entered by a compiler, the program instructions being operable to display the default explanatory note simultaneously with the information in a particular sub-portion of the database (*The topic-based navigation mode enables users to view and select topic objects in the content network. When a topic object is selected, the display interface is reorganized to allow the direct viewing of the meta-information associated with the topic object as well as related topic objects. Further, during the topic-based navigation mode, the display interface includes a related content window, which presents a summary of content objects that are pertinent to the selected topic. Accordingly, meta-information for the related content object is displayed, as well as related objects, [0110]-[0111]*).

13. **Claims 12-13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oren et al. (Pat. No. US 6,539,387, filed on July 7, 1997; hereinafter Oren) in view of Flinn et al. (Pub. No. US 2001/0047358, filed on March 13, 2001; hereinafter Flinn),

further in view of Flora et al. (Pat. No. US 6,714,215, filed on May 19, 2000; hereinafter Flora), and further in view of Nielsen (Pat. No. US 5,761,436, published on June 2, 1998).

Regarding **claim 12**, Oren, as modified by Flinn and Flora, does not teach a feedback component permitting any part of the information contained in a sub-portion or explanatory note of the database, to be selected by a user, and for the user's selection to be recorded.

However, Nielson discloses a feedback component including program instructions permitting any part of the information contained in a sub-portion or explanatory note of the database, to be selected by a user, and for the user's selection to be recorded (*a user interface that allows a user to interact with a computer display by pointing at selectable control areas on the display and activating a command or computer operation associated with the selectable control area*, [Column 4, Lines 11-15]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Nielson with the teachings of Oren, as modified by Flora and Flinn, for the purpose of allowing the user to more quickly find and reference previously viewed hypernode by providing a hypertext user with a history facility for displaying accessed hypernodes ([Abstract] of Nielsen).

Regarding **claim 13**, Nielson further discloses recording users' selections of primary and secondary key expressions (*A user interface that allows a user to interact with a computer display by pointing at selectable control areas on the display and activating a command or computer operation associated with the selectable control*

Art Unit: 2165

area, [Column 4, Lines 11-15]). It's obvious that the primary and secondary key expressions are recorded since their accessed records are used to make up the history list for displaying accessed hypernodes).

Conclusion

14. These following prior arts made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure:

Szabo (Pat. No. US 7,181,438) teaches database access system.

Rennison et al. (Pat. No. US 6,154,213) teaches immersive movement-based interaction with large complex information structures.

Becker et al. (Pat. No. US 6,848,075) teaches Internet web browser with memory enhanced hyperlink display.

The Examiner requests, in response to this Office action, support(s) must be shown for language added to any original claims on amendment and any new claims. That is, indicate support for newly added claim language by specifically pointing to page(s) and line no(s) in the specification and/or drawing figure(s). This will assist the Examiner in prosecuting the application.

When responding to this office action, Applicant is advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present, in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

Contact Information

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Son T. Hoang whose telephone number is (571) 270-1752. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (7:30 AM – 4:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Christian Chace can be reached on (571) 272-4190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Son T Hoang/
Examiner, Art Unit 2165
October 22, 2008

/S. P./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2164

/Christian P. Chace/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165

